

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE  
ON DISARMAMENT

PRIVATE  
ENDC/PV.16  
6 April 1962  
ENGLISH

THE UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

FEB 6 1963

DOCUMENT  
COLLECTION

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTEENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Friday, 6 April 1962, at 10 a.m..

Chairman:

Mr. de MELLO-FRANCO

(Brazil)

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. de MELLO-FRANCO  
Mr. RODRIGUES RIBAS  
Mr. ASSUNCAO de ARAUJO  
Mr. de ALENCAR ARAUJO

Bulgaria:

Mr. M. TARABANOV  
Mr. K. CHRISTOV  
Mr. G. GUELEV  
Mr. N. MINICHEV

Burma:

Mr. J. BARRINGTON  
U Tin MAUNG

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS  
Mr. J.F.M. BELL  
Mr. R. TAIT

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. J. HAJEK  
Mr. E. PEPICH  
Mr. M. ZEMLA  
Mr. V. VAJNAR

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. GEBRE-EGZY  
Mr. M. HAMID  
Mr. A. MANDEPRO

India:

Mr. A.S. LALL  
Mr. A.S. MEHTA  
Mr. C.K. GAIPOLA  
Mr. M.B. NAIR

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

<u>Italy:</u>	Mr. F. CAVALLETTI Mr. A. CAGIATI Mr. C. COSTA-RIGHINI
<u>Mexico:</u>	Mr. L. PADILLA NERVO Mr. E. CALDERON PUIG Miss E. AGUIRRE Mr. D. GONZALEZ
<u>Nigeria:</u>	Mr. A.A. ATTA
<u>Poland:</u>	Mr. M. NASZKOWSKI Mr. M. LACHS Mr. M. BIEN Mr. W. WIECZOREK
<u>Romania:</u>	Mr. G. MACOVESCU Mr. M. MALITZA Mr. C. SANDRU Mr. E. GLASER
<u>Sweden:</u>	Mr. R. EDBERG Mr. H. BLIX Mr. B. FRIEDMAN
<u>Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:</u>	Mr. V.A. ZORIN Mr. S.K. TSARAPKIN Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN Mr. V.N. ZHEREBTSOV
<u>United Arab Republic:</u>	Mr. A.F. HASSAN Mr. A. EL-ERIAN Mr. M.S. AHMED Mr. S. ABDEL-HAMID

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

United Kingdom:

Mr. J.B. GODBER  
Sir Michael WRIGHT  
Mr. J.S.H. SHATTOCK  
Lord NORWICH

United States of America:

Mr. A. DEAN  
Mr. C.C. STELLE  
Mr. V. BAKER  
Mr. T.R. PICKERING

Special Representative of the  
Secretary-General:

Mr. O. LOUTFI

Deputy to the Special Representative  
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Brazil) (translation from French): The sixteenth meeting of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament is called to order.

Mr. HAJEK (Czechoslovakia): I would like to express the satisfaction of my delegation at the matter-of-fact and useful discussion which has been going on in our Committee for the last few days, a discussion on the main problem before the Committee, namely, the drafting of a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control. This is certainly a gratifying fact, and we think it is the only correct method ensuing from the adopted procedure.

Let us hope that the negotiation by both co-Chairmen on the draft preamble will soon lead to a positive outcome and that a co-ordinated draft acceptable to all delegations will be submitted to the Committee. We feel that the same procedure should be applied as regards the first and subsequent articles of the draft treaty. In this way it will be possible to bridge the existing differences of opinion without undue delay and to come to concrete conclusions.

The Czechoslovak delegation welcomes the fact that other delegations also have begun a concrete and matter-of-fact consideration and elaboration of drafts submitted to our Committee, have expounded their views on the preamble and article 1 of the Soviet draft treaty (ENDC/2), and have submitted their observations and their own suggestions and proposals on those questions. It is a positive phenomenon that the delegation of the United States has begun a systematic and orderly consideration of the documents submitted to us and has also presented proposals of its own.

Permit me in this connexion to make a few comments on the proposal presented by the United States delegation at our meeting on 4 April (ENDC/18). This proposal may be compared to a certain degree with the Soviet draft of article 1 of the treaty which the Committee began to consider at its twelfth meeting. Mr. Dean also mentioned this when submitting the draft on 4 April (ENDC/PV.15). Both drafts deal in principle with the same problems and contain many identical and analogous provisions. There are, however, some differences between them.

The draft submitted by the Soviet Union is worked out in greater detail and constitutes a step forward to a further elaboration of principles contained in the Joint Statement of the Governments of the Soviet Union and

the United States of 20 September 1961 (ENDC/5). The draft submitted by the the United States, on its part, limits itself in substance to paraphrasing, and in some parts simply to repeating, these principles without further elaboration of them.

I would submit that we are a little further ahead. In the introduction to the treaty, the content of general and complete disarmament is not only a general and distant aim but a binding, concrete task. This is the way in which our delegation understands our task. This is the logic of the matter: if we proceed in all seriousness to the drafting of the treaty, as we are charged to do according to the Joint Statement and the rules of procedure that we set for ourselves (ENDC/1 and Add.1), then it means that we should specify the obligations to be undertaken by the signatories of the treaty - obligations delimited and defined as to their content and the time limits for their implementation. This brings us to a further postulate. It is fully appropriate that article 1 of the treaty should contain a binding time limit for its implementation. A mere re-statement of the principle set forth in the Joint Statement to the effect that time limits must be set for individual stages is no longer sufficient in the treaty itself. Our discussion has shown that all delegations who have spoken on this question do accept in principle the idea of time limits.

The Soviet draft of article 1 envisages that general and complete disarmament should be achieved within the period of four years. We believe that this limit is realistic and may be implemented. It is based, inter alia, on the experience gained by a number of States since World War II.

The specific time-limit may, however, be subject to discussion. Several delegations stated their views on that. India, for instance, proposed a period of, at most, four or five years; Lord Home mentioned nine years. We believe, in adhering to the proposed limit of four years, that at this stage of our deliberation the decisive question is to reach agreement on the fact that a binding time-limit should be fixed for the implementation of the treaty on general and complete disarmament. It would be, in fact, devoid of any logic if we accepted time-limits for individual stages but not for the entire programme of general and complete disarmament, as envisaged, for instance, in the United States draft (ENDC/6). My delegation would be happy to hear a clarification of the views held on this question by the United States delegation.

(Mr. Hajek, Czechoslovakia)

The draft of the United States does not specifically mention foreign military bases and foreign armed forces stationed in the territories of other States. We regard this as a question of great importance, and there is full justification for expressly including it in article 1 of the treaty.

The representative of the United Kingdom, Mr. Godber, said at our twelfth meeting that no difference should be made between foreign and national bases. He asserted that in the process of disarmament foreign bases will be liquidated simultaneously with national bases, if not earlier (ENDC/PV.12, page 33). We understand that the United Kingdom delegation approves in principle of the elimination of foreign bases even at an earlier stage of the disarmament process; it is only that it does not wish to have this specified as a special category of military potential. My delegation would like to present some arguments in connexion with this reservation.

The question of foreign bases has, as we all know, for a number of years been one of the basic problems of disarmament talks. What is really the core of the matter? In our opinion it cannot be denied that military bases on foreign territory have a quite specific military, strategic and political mission. One need only take into account some elements -- their geographical dispersion, technical facilities and other relevant facts -- to see at first sight that these bases are substantially different from national bases, and from the point of view of the danger of a sudden outbreak of war constitute an exceptionally important category of military potential. I do not wish to insist here on the political aspect, which is, I think, obvious to everyone in this Committee and which demonstrates the importance of dismantling the foreign bases in order to create a good climate for the process of disarmament itself. Therefore, it seems to us to be fully logical, from all aspects, that article 1 should specify foreign bases as a separate issue.

My delegation likewise deems it correct that, within the framework of general and complete disarmament, the use of nuclear weapons should be expressly prohibited. This measure, as we all know, has gained wide support in the world, and this has been demonstrated, among other things, by the fact that upon the initiative of several Afro-Asian countries the sixteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolution 1653 (XVI) calling for the signing of a special convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Therefore, it seems to us that this measure should be included in the list of the obligations resulting from the treaty on general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Hajek, Czechoslovakia)

Permit me to say a few words now on the question of control, which is perhaps the only question on which the draft of the United States differs in its wording from the Joint Statement. I am very sorry to say that, unlike the Soviet draft of article 1, in the draft of the United States this particular issue is not an elaboration of the principles contained in the Joint Statement; it is a change. And my delegation is sorry to say that it is not a change for the better -- far from it. The formulation of the United States draft goes beyond the framework of those principles. The second sentence of paragraph 3 of this draft reverts to the demand that the scope of control measures should go beyond the scope of disarmament measures to be undertaken. This seems to us to be in clear contradiction with paragraph 6 of the Joint Statement.

We believe that it is especially on the question of control, which has been among the thorniest problems encountered in disarmament talks, that we should be very careful, and that we should strictly adhere to the principles formulated in the Joint Statement and not change or circumvent them in any way in the working out of the draft treaty. It is not my intention to go into this question in greater detail today, as I am sure there will be time to do that when we start considering article 2 of the Soviet draft, which deals with the question of control.

In general, it would be commendable if we continued to proceed with a businesslike concrete discussion, as provided for in the agreement on procedure which the Committee has started to apply. This method should be followed in our future work and should be further developed. This would bring us as quickly as possible to the fulfilment of the primary objective faced by the Committee. If we continue in this direction, there can be no unsurmountable difficulties in our future talks, given a sufficient measure of goodwill by all who are involved.

May I, in conclusion, express the hope of my delegation that it will very soon be possible -- and perhaps ever more quickly and effectively -- to move to the consideration of the following articles of the treaty on general and complete disarmament?



Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): Before I commence, may I apologise in advance to my colleagues for the fact that I may be unable to stay this morning to listen to the whole of the discussion because I have to catch a plane and return to London. However, I shall be back on Monday and will read with care the verbatim record of all subsequent comments. I merely state that in advance in order to assure the Committee that no discourtesy is intended.

I have considered and studied with interest the comments made so far in this debate, and in particular the paper (ENDC/18) which our United States colleague tabled at our meeting on 4 April when we discussed this matter. As Mr. Dean explained, this paper covers the same ground as that covered by part I of the Soviet draft treaty (ENDC/2), and as such I think it enables us to make a direct comparison between the two points of view. This, I think, will undoubtedly help us to make progress towards the agreement for which we are all working, and in that connexion I think the paper (ENDC/19) which Mr. Burns of Canada has submitted is also a valuable contribution; I will touch on that again before I close.

On reading through the United States paper, I thought it was valuable to see now closely it adhered to the framework, and indeed in many cases to the actual **wording**, of the Statement of Agreed Principles (ENDC/5). In that connexion I noticed that our Czechoslovak colleague, to whom we have just listened with care and interest, said that restatement of the principles is no longer sufficient in the treaty itself. I think that is what he said. That may be so in regard to the substantive treaty articles, but I should have thought that in this initial stage there was certainly no harm in restating the principles on which we all agree -- indeed I think it would be valuable to do so.

I trust that this adherence to the Agreed Principles will recommend the United States paper in the main to my colleagues in the Conference, and I hope it will simplify our problems when we come, as we must, to the task of reconciling this document with the corresponding section of the Soviet draft. So far, of course, these parallel contributions cover only what both the United States and the Soviet Union refer to as part I -- that is to say, what in the United States proposal is referred to as objectives and in the Soviet draft as obligations. I do not think there is any real significance in that difference of wording, and

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

obviously that can be brought into accord. True, the word "obligations" is, I suppose, more precise in its effect, but I would think that if there were any desire to bring these two feelings together the use of the phrase "outline of obligations" might possibly be the way to do it. I merely throw that out as a suggestion in case there should be any feeling that there is any difference in regard to those two particular words.

The main thing, of course, is that the obligations are in fact entered into in regard to the specific articles dealing with the substantive matters, to which we shall be turning in a short time. Therefore whatever word one uses here must, I think, be only illustrative, and whatever is agreed to in these preliminary articles can become effective only when we have agreed the substantive articles to which they refer. So whether we used the word "objectives", the word "obligations" of the phrase "outline of obligations", or some similar phrase, is not particularly important.

I do not think we need to analyse these individual proposals in detail or deeply at this stage, because each is discussed separately in considerably more detail at a later stage of the two plans. At present, therefore, while still confining ourselves to the broad issues, let us compare the two drafts before us and see how closely they resemble each other. I think the best way to do this is by trying to establish three separate and distinct categories. I would suggest that the first one would contain those points on which there is still definite disagreement; the second would comprise certain points on which the drafts do not at present agree but on which agreement may in fact come of itself at a later stage when perhaps we are able to see a little more clearly the shape that our agreed disarmament process will eventually take; and the third category -- and that is the one in which I am most interested at the moment and which, I am glad to say, is the largest, at least so far as part I is concerned -- would cover the area in which we find ourselves in unanimous agreement.

As I see it, the points of real disagreement in part I are relatively few. The reference in the Soviet draft to foreign military bases is one of these, and we heard our Czechoslovak colleague's views on this point this morning. I expressed certain views in this respect earlier in our discussion. Having listened with great care to what our colleague from Czechoslovakia said,

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

I am afraid I am still unconvinced of the need to differentiate in this regard. It seems to me that, whatever one calls bases and wherever they are situated, if we are genuine and sincere in our proposal in regard to disarmament bases automatically disappear, whether they be foreign bases, or home bases, or whatever they may be. This seems to me to be an illusory point which is being brought forward, and it appears unnecessary to disturb the good feeling in this Conference because of it. I would have thought it was basic to our whole consideration of this matter that all these bases would in fact disappear as we proceeded with the disarmament process.

To seek to differentiate foreign bases seems to me to imply some feeling that we are not going to succeed in our general disarmament task. That is not my approach; I believe we are going to succeed and that therefore, whether the bases are on foreign territory or anywhere else, they will be eliminated. I think that we can safely refer to all bases and that it is not necessary to differentiate. However, I do not wish to put the point higher than that -- but it does seem to me that this matter will solve itself and need not be a cause for major difficulty. So let us put this problem on one side for the moment; there is no need to let it create difficulties in our discussion at this stage.

As I have said, the second category comprises those areas where the two drafts do not altogether coincide -- not necessarily because of inherent disagreement but merely because they are areas on which we are not yet in a position to reach final decisions. The time limit for the disarmament process -- also referred to by our Czechoslovak colleague this morning -- is one example of what I mean, for, until we have established exactly what measures we are going to agree upon and exactly what degree of verification will be necessary for each measure, how can we possibly tell how long it is going to take?

The exact method of transition between the stages in the disarmament programme is another example. On both these points I shall have more to say later. But for the moment I would suggest that we might put them aside, as I suggested for the first category. I therefore do not propose to follow up in detail the point which our Czechoslovak colleague raised in regard to the part of the United States draft which deals with verification. I would have thought that this was a matter which we could come back to and iron out at a later stage as we see what we are proposing to verify. It seems to me it would be better to deal with it in relation to precise proposals, and the problem may not seem as large then as it would if we dealt with it on its own.

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

I now come to the area where I think we can claim full agreement, and this, I submit, does give us a firm basis for our work in the drafting of a treaty on general and complete disarmament acceptable to us all. I have gone very carefully through part I of the United States draft and part I of the Soviet draft, and I have drawn up the following list of points on which it seems to me that no disagreement exists. Many of these points may appear obvious. On certain others I think the drafts might well have diverged, and I think we can congratulate ourselves that many potential problems and possible points of disagreement have not in fact arisen.

I would like to read this list out to the Committee. I have confined myself in the list to those principles which are explicitly stated in both the plans. The area of implicit agreement would well range considerably further. Here, then, is the list which I have compiled:

1. Disarmament should be general and complete.
2. States will have at their disposal at the end of the disarmament process only these non-nuclear armaments, forces, facilities and establishments as are agreed to be necessary to maintain internal order and to protect the personal security of citizens.
3. The proposed disarmament treaty should provide for the disbanding of armed forces, the dismantling of military establishments, the cessation of the production of armaments, and the liquidation or conversion to peaceful use of those that already exist.
4. The elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and other weapons of mass destruction, and the cessation of the production of such weapons.
5. The elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction.
6. The cessation of military training and the closing of all military training institutions.
7. The discontinuance of military expenditures.
8. The establishment and provision for the effective operation of an international disarmament organization for the purpose of ensuring that all obligations under the disarmament programme are honoured and observed from beginning to end.

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

9. Disarmament will be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any State or group of States gain military advantage.

10. As national armaments are reduced, the United Nations would be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to ensure international security and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

11. Verification arrangements will be instituted progressively, as necessary.

12. Transition from one stage of disarmament to the next should take place upon a decision that all measures in the preceding stage have been implemented and verified, and that any additional verification arrangements required for measures in the next stage are, when appropriate, ready to operate.

Those, then, are twelve points on which there is no disagreement of substance, I believe. A large part of that list, it may be said, is already covered by the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles. That is certainly true, but the appearance of these two drafts of part I of our treaty has, in my submission, enabled us to move a stage forward from the Agreed Principles. We are beginning to fill them out and it is the filling out of these principles which eventually will provide us with the treaty which we are all working to achieve.

I would therefore like, if I may, to put a proposal to the Committee. I should like to move that our United States and Soviet colleagues confirm that the list I have given contains those points which are common to both plans. I would propose that they should add to this list or, if necessary, subtract from it, and that it should then be tabled as a base from which an agreed draft of our objectives and our obligations on general principles can be prepared. We should then have to decide into whose hands the work of drafting should be entrusted. Should it be the work of the plenary Conference or should it be the work of the Committee of the Whole? Or should we ask the co-Chairmen to add this responsibility to the many others that we keep thrusting on them? Or should we seek to form a separate sub-committee which would prepare the first master draft and submit it to the plenary Conference at a given date? My own preference would be for the last of these possibilities, but the United Kingdom delegation would be perfectly happy to agree to whatever the Committee considered most appropriate in this regard.

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

The important thing is that a decision on this matter should be taken and that we should get something on paper as soon as possible. I do think we have got to study this particular procedural point because we are, I hope, going to be faced with a great deal of drafting as the weeks go by. As I have indicated, my own feeling is that this will be done better by a relatively small sub-committee working on these points as we reach firm agreements on matters of substance. We cannot seek to finalize drafts of particular words round this table. Obviously, when a draft is put before us we can criticize and delete certain words or add certain words, but the actual building up of the framework of the words of the article is something which I would have thought would be better done in some form of sub-committee. But, as I have indicated, if our colleagues, the co-Chairmen, desire to take on all this extra work, who am I to seek to prevent them from adding this to their difficulties? I merely put this to the Committee as I see it.

So much for Part I, this general section of our agreed draft.

I would like to say a word or two now about our methods of procedure on the following sections when we shall really come to discuss those more substantive measures in which I think we are all interested. In this connexion I think all of us must have welcomed the very interesting and constructive speech which the representative of Canada made at the fifteenth meeting of the Committee last Wednesday. It will be recalled that Mr. Burns said:

"... if one document is taken as the framework of our discussions, it puts these who are adhering to the formulation of the other document at a negotiating disadvantage. They would be put in the position of always having to offer amendments or objections, and thus would be shown, artificially, as being negative in their attitude. I am sure that no one here wishes to adopt a procedure which would have that result." (ENDC/PV.15 page 46).

I do not think we do want to adopt such a procedure. This seems to me a very valid point, and I am sure that representatives will agree that the quickest way of making progress in our present discussions will be to take up these various measures one by one, in each case making a direct and an equitable comparison, without prejudice, between the two points of view.

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

As for the order in which these measures should be considered, I favour Mr. Burns' suggestion that the Committee should select from the proposals of both sides those which are susceptible of relatively easy agreement and work on them until a conclusion is reached. I do attach considerable importance to this, because I believe that as we achieve agreement on certain articles, so confidence among us will grow; and I think that is extremely important. The better the atmosphere, the more we can do in agreement, the easier it will be for us to resolve any genuine difficulties as they arise. So I think the chart which Mr. Burns circulated to the members of the Committee (ENDC/19 Rev.1) should be most useful in this connexion. The idea strikes me as being not only extremely sensible but easily acceptable, and I ask the Committee to give it the most serious consideration.

Of course there are many other possible ways of taking up these substantive issues. One which occurs to me would be to have a general debate on the substantive stage I measures when we have completed this Part I, upon which I commented earlier. Such a general debate would obviously need to occupy several days, since we would be taking up the substantive points of difference or of agreement. This general debate could be followed by a more detailed discussion of stage I measures, area by area and comparable article by comparable article, as we worked along through them.

I can see that there is possibly real merit in discussing these provisions generally in one substantial debate, and then going on to deal with the separate points. I am merely suggesting that these are two separate ways of dealing with the matter, and I am quite willing to be guided by the Committee in regard to the way in which we do it. I am only seeking the most sensible, workmanlike way to proceed, and I am quite sure that other members of the Committee will have other suggestions to make as to how we should go forward. I shall certainly study those with keen interest, because I think we have got to get the maximum agreement on how we shall proceed if our work is to be fruitful. I have put forward my ideas with the sole purpose of seeing real and effective progress on the measures before us.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republic) (translation from Russian).

We have listened with attention to the statements made this morning and we have studied the remarks and suggestions that were made at our last meeting, when we were discussing the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament.

We are very glad that today's discussion has taken the form of considering in a concrete manner the drafts which have been submitted, and that attempts are being made to find common ground in these drafts and then to ascertain the differences that may exist on individual questions.

At our meeting on 4 April, when the Conference, in accordance with the agreed procedure, was considering the question of general and complete disarmament, the United States delegation submitted a document (ENDC/18) relating to the first part of a draft treaty, which would follow immediately after the preamble. I should like to express my approval - as other delegations have already expressed theirs - of the step taken by the United States, since this helps us to move forward in considering in a concrete and business-like manner the basic parts of the draft treaty which we are to prepare.

We intend to discuss very carefully all the proposals and documents which have already been submitted, so as to take into account as far as possible the points of view and positions of the delegations and prepare an agreed draft treaty. As we have been able to see, all the members of the Conference have invariably followed this policy, both in discussing the draft preamble and in considering article 1 of the draft treaty submitted by the Soviet Union (ENDC/2) and the corresponding section of the United States programme for disarmament put forward by President Kennedy at the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly (ENDC/6). The submission by the United States delegation of this new document affords, so it seems to us, even greater opportunities for following the procedure of work we have already established.

Before commenting on the substance of the United States document relating to part 1 of the draft treaty, I should like to draw attention to a remark Mr. Dean made when introducing this new United States document. He said that, after agreeing the preamble to the treaty -

"We can quickly follow this agreement on the preamble with agreement on another significant section of the basic treaty provisions."

(ENDC/PV.15, page )



(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Mr. Dean meant agreement on the first, introductory part of the treaty, covering provisions defining the full range of measures for general and complete disarmament, laying down the basic principles of control over such disarmament, and the principles to be followed in taking measures to ensure security during the process of general and complete disarmament and upon its completion. I want to emphasize this thought.

Mr. Dean suggested that we should move our discussions ahead to what he called the substantive areas of general and complete disarmament, after agreeing these basic provisions. We share this view and cannot do otherwise, because it accords with the procedure of work approved by the Conference. We think that this question ought to be regarded as settled, and I should not like our attention to be diverted to consideration of the new procedural proposals which were put forward at our last meeting and mentioned today by the United Kingdom representative, because I think that these new procedural proposals would merely divert us from the correct and, I consider, perfectly efficient procedure already established here.

Of course, each delegation is free, for its own purpose and for consultation with other delegations, to draw up any possible outlines and compile any possible comparisons of various parts of the documents, and each delegation can use all these documents in its own way. But if we were to try to lay down now, in the middle of getting on with our work, as was suggested today by the United Kingdom representative, a special procedure of selecting issues, which would have to be discussed separately and which would somehow determine our further work, I am profoundly convinced - and apparently all the members of the Conference will agree with me - that merely in order to select these questions by agreement, it would be necessary to spend a tremendous amount of time. This time would be spent to no purpose, because the substance of the questions would still remain, and we would examine them in the course of our subsequent discussions, when we came to each one of them. But to select these questions now, to pick them out from the whole complex of the draft treaty would mean wasting time and scrapping the whole normal procedure of our work.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

In order to agree this list of questions which, by the way, Mr. Burns has brought to our attention, to examine them and say whether we agree to discuss them this way or that, to juxtapose or not juxtapose particular points, I am afraid we would have to spend more time than on the discussion of the substantive questions themselves. I think it would be a fruitless labour and even harmful, since it would divert us from a step-by-step consideration of the basic questions in the draft treaty and of the documents which are submitted by each delegation.

We must go along the sensible path we have already been following; and we are, I think, working normally in this way. In my opinion, we should consider the question of our future work settled, and in the interests of the business the Committee will continue the practical discussion of the appropriate parts of the documents that have been submitted with a view to preparing a mutually-acceptable draft treaty on general and complete disarmament.

After Mr. Dean had explained the basic provisions of the document submitted by him, and compared it with the first three articles of our draft treaty, he pointed out that there was considerable agreement between our two positions. The United Kingdom representative also mentioned this today. Moreover, Mr. Dean said that it would be useful to record this agreement.

We fully share the point of view of Mr. Dean and Mr. Godber, and are prepared for our part to co-operate in every way in order to reach agreement as soon as possible on the first articles of the draft treaty, defining the full range of measures for general and complete disarmament and the main principles of its implementation, including the principles of control over such disarmament and the ensuring of security in the course of its implementation.

Mr. Dean explained that the document he had submitted was comparable with the first part of the draft treaty submitted by the Soviet Union, although it was set out in a somewhat different form. In this connexion I should like to dwell on one or two points.

In the general debate many delegates referred in one way or another to the question of what the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament should end in. And it must be said that the overwhelming majority of the States represented on this Committee, as was evident from their statements, consider that our work should end in the elaboration of a document, if only in first draft form, which would not be a mere repetition of generalities but a working draft of a treaty on general and complete disarmament. In this connexion I should like to remind you of the statement made by the representative of India, Mr. Menon, at our meeting on 20 March.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Mr. Menon said that -

"... It should be possible for a committee of this body ... to ... produce what might be called a 'skeleton' treaty into which the various ideas could be fitted". (ENDC/PV.5, page 34)

I would add to this that the closer the document is to a final draft treaty form, the clearer and more precise the provisions which it contains, the closer will be the day when governments will in fact set about the practical solution of the problem of general disarmament, and the world will begin freeing itself of the burden of armaments and the concomitant danger of the outbreak of a new war.

We have passed the stage when we could limit ourselves to general discussions, a general outlining of principles, schemes or desires. Our Committee did not start its work from scratch. The very resolution of the General Assembly, which set up this Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament contains the starting point for its work - the basic principles of general and complete disarmament that were agreed between the United States and the Soviet Union in the course of bilateral talks in the summer of 1961.

The basic principles of disarmament constitute the line from which we must go forward. There would be little sense in our work if it were reduced to a repetition of documents that had already been published. There would be no sense in our assembling here if all we had to do was to mark time. It was precisely these considerations that led the Soviet Government to submit a draft treaty, so that we might take the next practical step in solving the problem of general and complete disarmament.

In this connexion, I must confess we were somewhat puzzled by Mr. Dean's statement that in the first part of the treaty we should limit ourselves to a restatement of the basic agreed principles of general and complete disarmament; and we were quite at a loss to understand his statement that this would be a more business-like approach than that proposed by the Soviet Government.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Our proposal was to define and lay down in the first articles of the treaty the obligations of States in regard to the full range of general and complete disarmament, certain basic methods for its implementation, and the basic provisions for control and ensuring the security of States. Mr. Dean said that the obligations in the first three articles of the Soviet draft treaty could be more appropriately regarded as descriptions; ~~that~~ is, they describe what the treaty would accomplish. He added that these articles, as was readily apparent, did not constitute obligations in and of themselves. Nowhere in his statement, however, was Mr. Dean able to explain why the provisions of the first articles of the Soviet draft treaty are not obligations of States. Perhaps the United States delegation believes in general that it is impossible to formulate the obligations of States in relation to general and complete disarmament.

We consider that this is precisely the purpose of our work here, namely to try to draft a treaty which would lay down the obligations of States both in relation to the full scope of the whole disarmament process and in relation to its separate stages.

I must add that on this question Mr. Dean seems to contradict some of the propositions which he himself formulated. I should like to recall that on 30 March, when commenting on article 1 of our draft, Mr. Dean, and also Mr. Godber, saw some difficulty in discussing this article, because, to quote Mr. Godber, it "is extraordinarily broad in its concept; indeed it is a summary of a great many of the matters which we have to discuss" (ENDC/PV.12, page 28). The same thought, although in a rather different form, was also expressed by Mr. Dean.

We consider, however, and I hope that other delegates will agree, that article 1 of the draft treaty is certainly not a description, as Mr. Dean said, and still less a summary or résumé. It is not an ancillary technical article linking together other articles, but an article of considerable political importance. It not only lays down the main tasks, but also defines the basic content of the full scope of general and complete disarmament in respect to the disarmament measures themselves.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

In this connexion, let us take a look, not at the Soviet draft treaty, but at the United States document of 25 September 1961, which broadly corresponds to article 1 of our draft. I shall read out the beginning of the first paragraph of this United States document:

"The Nations of the world;

".....

"Set forth as the objectives of a programme of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world:" (ENDC/6, page 1).

This is followed in the United States document by a list of measures to be included in general and complete disarmament. Therefore, when the United States enumerates the measures for general and complete disarmament, it intends, or at least intended in September 1961, as is clearly shown in its document, to lay down the objectives of general and complete disarmament, although it obviously avoided stating that the whole range of the proposed measures also constitutes the obligations of States undertaking general and complete disarmament.

From what I have just said, it is clear that we cannot brush aside the very complicated political importance of article 1 for the successful solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament by referring to it as a description, summary or résumé.

The tasks defined in Part I of the Soviet draft (ENDC/2) fall, as it were, into three categories which are mutually interdependent and at the same time have characteristics of their own. The first is a definition of the whole range of measures which, in combination, ensure general and complete disarmament. The next is the whole range of measures relating to control over general and complete disarmament. Finally, measures for assuring security both during the process of general and complete disarmament and after its completion.

All these three aspects of the question are, as we know, reflected in the three articles of Part I and in the Agreed Principles of disarmament which we have all approved.

At our meeting of 30 March, Mr. Dean, and also Mr. Godber, said that it would be impossible to agree upon article 1 of the treaty without going through the entire treaty or almost the entire treaty. It is true that at our meeting of 4 April Mr. Dean appeared to have abandoned this view. I have gained the impression that Mr. Godber, apparently, has also abandoned this view today. We, of course, welcome the change.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Indeed, we cannot seriously and effectively consider other parts and articles of the treaty before reaching agreement in principle on the basic parts of article 1, which defines the general scope of general and complete disarmament. Similarly, we cannot do this successfully without studying article 2 and 3. All the subsequent parts and articles of the treaty which deal with specific stages of disarmament, the establishment of a system of control, and the implementation of measures to ensure security, relate by their nature to the content of the disarmament measures applicable to the various stages, to the procedure and methods of achieving the objectives which we will place before the governments in the first three articles of the treaty.

It should be clear to everyone that, before we set about agreeing on the procedure, priority and means of implementing the various disarmament measures, we must settle what we understand by general and complete disarmament, what are the objectives in the field of complete and general disarmament, and what is the general scope of the obligations which will subsequently be distributed over the various stages of disarmament. Before answering the question of when and at what stage we shall, for example, cease the production of nuclear weapons, we need to know whether we are going at all to prohibit nuclear weapons and cease their production.

You will say that the answer to this question is clear: "Yes, we shall." Well, then, let us write it down. That is precisely the meaning of reaching agreement on the provisions of article 1 of the draft treaty.

Before answering the question whether we shall reduce the means of delivery of nuclear weapons and conventional weapons in the first stage by 30 or 100 per cent, or by some other amount, we must answer the question whether we are going at all to set ourselves the aim of eliminating the means of delivery of nuclear weapons and conventional arms. You will say: "Yes, we are." Well, then, let us write this down in the way provided in article 1 of our draft treaty.

I think that what I have said should suffice to explain the need for clear and definite agreement regarding the whole range of measures which will constitute general and complete disarmament, before going on to actually more detailed work and discussion regarding the procedure and methods of implementing them stage by stage and regarding the content of the measures at each stage. When Mr. Dean submitted the new United States document at the

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

meeting of 4 April, he emphasized more than once that it essentially repeated the basic Agreed Principles in all its provisions. This was also stated by the United Kingdom representative today.

I have already said that we ought not to dawdle on a beaten track, but make headway, develop these principles and make them more explicit. I gathered from Mr. Dean's statement that he has no objection to this.

In explaining paragraph A2 of the United States document, which deals with the components of general and complete disarmament, he said in particular:

"Let me make it quite clear that if there are any points that are implicitly omitted from this list we will be quite prepared to add them." (ENDC/PV.15, pages 35).

He was referring directly to article 1 of the Soviet draft treaty, which, as he admitted, contains a more extensive list of the components of general and complete disarmament.

These remarks of Mr. Dean give us grounds for assuming that the United States delegation is not opposed to specifying the whole range of measures for general and complete disarmament. In our view it is absolutely essential to do so.

I do not wish to take up the time of the Committee by dwelling on all the points of our article 1 relating to measures of general and complete disarmament, and on similar provisions in the United States document. I will only cite a few examples in order to illustrate my thought regarding the need to develop and make more explicit the propositions contained in the Agreed Principles, and not simply repeat them.

Let us take, for example, the point regarding the need to discontinue spending money for military purposes. It was pointed out in my previous intervention that we considered it essential to make this point more explicit and to close all loop-holes which might make it possible to divert resources to the re-establishment of the military machine and the production of armaments. It is well known that such resources could be made available on government lines, as well as through various organizations and even private persons. Why should we not make provision for this contingency in the draft treaty? We have done so in our draft. I believe that we should all do so.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Or let us take, for example, paragraph 2 (a) of the United States document, which also repeats the wording of the basic principles of disarmament. This paragraph besides including in a single formula measures different in character, contains no mention of the need to prohibit the re-establishment of armed forces in any form. Surely such a stipulation is necessary in a draft treaty. We are convinced that it should be stipulated. And we have included a provision to this effect in our draft treaty.

Mr. Godber said today that we should confirm the provisions of the Agreed Principles which were submitted for our consideration as the starting points in our work. He explained in some detail that, although these principles had been generally agreed upon, it was necessary to confirm this here in the form in which they had been agreed. I wondered why we needed to confirm them in the form in which they had been agreed. These principles have not only been agreed between the United States and ourselves but have also been approved unanimously by the General Assembly of the United Nations. That is to say, 104 Governments, States Members of the United Nations, have already approved these principles. What need is there for us here in a Committee of Eighteen Nations and not 104, to approve these principles once again?

There is no need for that. They are already approved. If we have to do anything, then on the basis of these principles we should formulate a draft of a treaty which would make more explicit and broaden these principles, and we would then be able to present a document which would lay down the obligations of those States which would subsequently approve and sign the treaty. That is what I take to be the purpose of our work, and not simply approving old, agreed principles, which have already been approved by everyone. There is no sense in transcribing agreed principles from one paper to another; I think it would be a waste of time and delay our really important work of tackling the preparation of a draft treaty which would constitute a draft of the obligations of States. That would really make sense. It would be a step forward in comparison with the situation we had in the autumn of last year.



(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

During our further discussion we shall touch upon a number of other questions which appear both in article 1 of our draft treaty and also in the document submitted by the United States delegation. We are, of course, prepared to listen to the views of other delegations on our document and on the United States document.

In conclusion, I should like to stress that members of the Committee now have before them proposals from the two sides in respect of part 1 of the treaty, the purpose of which is to define first and foremost the whole range of measures for general and complete disarmament. This gives us an opportunity, without further delay, to agree on the basic provisions of this document, a draft treaty, and thus take a further step towards elaborating a treaty on general and complete disarmament. Of course, an exchange of views in the Committee may be very fruitful in the sense of additions to, expansions and interpretations of certain parts of the basic principles and the content which we put into the concept of general and complete disarmament. On the basis of this exchange of views the Co-Chairmen will, of course, study article 1 of the treaty, will take into account all the views, all the proposals, and will be able to submit an agreed draft article 1, as well as subsequent articles. If any questions remain unsettled, we will, of course, report to the Committee that we have failed to reach agreement on such and such points. I think we shall do this in the same way as we have already almost done in regard to the preamble of our treaty.

I hope that in the next day or two our United States colleague and myself will be able to submit a draft preamble, the greater part of which has already been agreed; only a few unagreed points are left. We shall submit these to the Committee for consideration. The Committee will be able to put forward any additional wishes or views, which we shall take into account at the next, the second reading of this document, or perhaps even immediately, if these views prove to be so convincing that both sides, so to speak, will reach agreement on this question.

I believe that we ought to proceed in this manner in the future. This is a working procedure which has fully justified itself.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): I asked to speak mainly because for some days I have owed a reply to Mr. Zorin, who very kindly asked me a question during the twelfth meeting of the Committee. The representative of the Soviet Union made the following comment on one of my earlier interventions:

"Attempts to evade consideration of the treaty on general and complete disarmament may even be involved. I say this because the phrase 'treaty or treaties' crept into the statements of two speakers: Mr. Dean, and Mr. Cavalletti, an old friend of ours. I do not know what is meant by this. For the moment we are dealing with a single treaty, not with treaties....." (ENDC/PV.12, page 53).

I thank Mr. Zorin for calling me his old friend. I appreciate that friendship, especially because it is based on the discussions we had together, which were sometimes very lively but, I must say, always friendly, in the Ten Nation Committee in 1960. At that time, the question of a treaty or treaties was much discussed, and was, so to speak, a stumbling block in our work. I think this question is now settled, which is a great advantage for us compared with the situation in 1960.

The rules of procedure we have ourselves adopted make it clear henceforth that if we succeed in reaching an agreement on a particular disarmament measure, we should not wait until all the disarmament treaties are ready and complete, but can immediately sign a treaty on the particular measure on which we have agreed. The very fact that we have set up an ad hoc Committee of the Whole shows that we are ready to conclude a first treaty, if possible, on the first concerted and coordinated measures - without prejudice, of course, to the treaty on general and complete disarmament that we must sign and which constitutes a much longer task whether it is to be merely a framework or a detailed treaty. If, for example, an agreement on cut-offs or on surprise attacks could be concluded here quickly, as I hope, the relevant measures could well be embodied in a separate treaty while work continued on a treaty on general and complete disarmament. On this point I think there is no disagreement between the Soviet and the Italian delegations.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

I will take advantage of having the floor to say a few words on the object of this meeting, namely article 1 of the Soviet draft treaty (ENDC/2), and the new document submitted on 4 April by the United States delegation (ENDC/18). These are very important, I would even say fundamental, texts for the continuation of our work.

I am sorry to say that my delegation has not yet had time to complete its study of them, but it wishes to do as soon as possible; if the Chairman agrees, it would like to express its opinion on the substance of these texts at one of our next meetings. It will be in a better position to do so now that it can profit from the very interesting statements made today by the delegations of Czechoslovakia, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. I refer, in particular, to the twelve points enumerated by the United Kingdom delegate.

We can, however, say this at once: at the twelfth meeting of the Committee, as my colleagues will remember, the Italian delegation envisaged a method of work slightly different from the comparison of the two texts submitted to us. We thought that to reach a quick result the best method would be to consider each fundamental problem, study it and solve it before starting work on the preparation and drafting of the texts. That method of work would not be contrary to our rules of procedure, which require us to examine certain texts but do not specify how this is to be done. It could be what one might call a vertical examination, article by article, or a horizontal examination, problem by problem. But I will not dwell on the question of which method of work we should choose.

I think an attempt at conciliation has been made by the co-Chairmen, and the Italian delegation will certainly not be the one to oppose it or to create difficulties. On the contrary, we are happy that this agreement has been reached. I recall that Mr. de Mello-Franco spoke of a cross-roads. Well, now we have chosen a road. I think we should take it as quickly as possible.

But let us examine and compare the texts. I must say that, at first sight, the United States text seems better adapted to the method of work we should have preferred. For we believe that there are three fundamental problems to be examined: the destruction of armaments, the verification of that destruction to ensure that it is honest and effective, and the establishment of a peace organization based on international law and possessing effective means of action.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

These three problems, these three pillars for our building, are in my opinion very clearly and distinctly enunciated in the text proposed by the United States delegation, and this clear enunciation will make our work easier and more expeditious. But, I am sorry to repeat, this is no more than a preliminary comment. I should like to examine in detail either the Soviet or the United States text at the next meeting, if the Conference will allow me. I shall naturally give special consideration to the working procedure which the United Kingdom representative proposed to us this morning, for I fully agree with him on the need to find the quickest way to reach an agreement.

Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): We notice that there is a great deal of similarity between part I of the Soviet draft -- that is, the part entitled "General" and article 1 headed "Disarmament Obligations" -- and part I of the United States draft, entitled "Objectives". It is true that there are some, although not many, serious differences between the two texts. But I think Mr. Godber was right in saying that the similarity is very wide. I therefore do not quite understand what all the difficulty has been this morning. I should have thought that, in so far as the United States and the Soviet Union have submitted corresponding drafts, we could spend our time quite fruitfully discussing those two drafts. I may be mistaken, but I think the United States delegation had precisely this in mind when it submitted its draft.

So I am compelled to agree with Mr. Godber that we should choose one of the two procedures -- either to leave it to the co-Chairmen, as usual, to work out an agreed draft and come back to us with what they have agreed and what they have not agreed, or to set up a sub-committee. As is well known, we do not much like the idea of appointing a sub-committee, because if we are to achieve proper results the two co-Chairmen must agree. If they devote their efforts to this and report back to us, and if there are differences, we will try to do something about it. I think this process is a much better one than that of setting up a sub-committee. If we do that this time, I am afraid that for every item that gives rise to difficulty we shall have a sub-committee, and that could go on throughout our work. I would therefore prefer to continue on the path we have followed so far and leave it to the two co-Chairmen to see what they can agree on.

(Mr. Gebre-Egzy, Ethiopia)

We realize that the absence of a complete draft in the form of a treaty from the United States delegation makes our work a little difficult, but it is our understanding that the United States delegation is working on this and I am sure it will be put before us as soon as it is completed. In that respect I think that in submitting this draft the United States delegation has been quite co-operative and most willing to accommodate us and the other major Power. I appreciate that because I feel that in drafting it they attempted to make it parallel with the Soviet draft so as to make our work easier. So I do not think there is any great difficulty here.

As to what should go into this part of the treaty, again I do not see much difficulty. It is true that the Soviet Union calls this "Disarmament Obligations" and the United States calls it "Objectives and Principles", but when the appropriate moment comes I am sure they will be able to agree on the title. From our point of view it does not really make much difference what it is called; what matters is what it contains. So here again I do not see much difficulty. I do not believe it would be correct to say that the Agreed Principles should not appear in this part. After all, these are the concrete measures on which we have all agreed, and they should appear in the first part of the treaty. But it is true that this should be detailed in such a way as to enable us to make progress in our work. I am therefore at a loss to know what the difficulty is, and I submit that we should continue along the path we have followed so far in our work -- that is, either discuss the provisions, or to ask the co-Chairmen to see if they can bring us an agreed text or to indicate to us what they have agreed on and what they cannot agree on.

Mr. LALL (India): I should like to ask a question. I understood the representative of the Soviet Union to suggest that the two co-Chairmen might get together and give us a joint paper on matters relating to Part I. We have not yet heard from the representative of the United States whether that is acceptable; we trust his silence means it is acceptable and that the co-Chairmen will try jointly to work out something. I am not sure what the Soviet proposal was, but I think it was that. If so, let us hope the two co-Chairmen are in agreement. If they are, that is excellent, and we can then talk about the next step.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I listened with great interest to what my colleague from the Soviet Union said this morning. I am of course always happy to meet with him and try to agree on a programme for our work. I might very briefly say this: it seems to me that we have now agreed to base our discussions on consideration of the proposals before us -- which so far at least include the Soviet draft treaty and the United States programme -- and of any other proposals which may be made. When we reach the phase of our work -- and in fact we are now entering this phase -- of actually discussing in detail stage 1 of the process of general and complete disarmament, we shall have to decide what to discuss. For example, the Soviet document deals first with the destruction of means of delivery; the United States plan deals first with the setting up of an international disarmament organization within the framework of the United Nations.

There have also been proposals from my delegation that we should deal first with the reduction of nuclear weapons. I am not sure that what Mr. Godber suggested was very different from what either Mr. Zorin or I outlined, but I do not think that it would be profitable to enter into a line-by-line discussion of the Soviet draft, or indeed of our draft or any other draft, until there had been a full discussion in the Committee of the substantive matters with which we must deal. I do not want to get into a semantic discussion at this stage. I will be happy to confer with my co-Chairman.

But we are all familiar with the type of contract where what you read on the first page seems to be very simple until you turn the page over and read the fine print on the back. I think we ought to have a full discussion in the Committee on the outline of the various types of obligations that we unanimously agree we want to carry out. I am a little troubled about setting forth all our obligations in an outline form before we have discussed what our obligations are to be. I am sure that after fuller discussion in the Committee we can work that out. It would seem to me that, in order to have an orderly discussion in the Committee, we must have a somewhat fuller discussion of the disarmament questions that we are going to work on first. That was my understanding of what Mr. Burns and Mr. Godber proposed this morning.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

As to the further work on Part I, which we call "Objectives and Principles", let me be clear. We do not have the slightest objection to working this out with our co-Chairmen. We should be very happy to confer with him at any time the Committee wants us to do so. For my part, I should like to hear a fuller expression of the views of all the members of the Committee. Until all members have had an opportunity to express themselves fully, I do not think my co-Chairmen and I should attempt to arrogate to ourselves the power to decide what the Conference is going to discuss. However, if it is the wish of the Conference, I should be very happy to confer with my co-Chairmen at any time.

Mr. LALL (India): Mr. Dean has been good enough to talk primarily about what happens when we come to consider stage I of the disarmament measures, the substantive measures of disarmament. My question, however, was related only to the prefatory stage, namely, the stage covered by the United States draft, document ENDC/18 dated 4 April, which deals with Part I, "Objectives and Principles", and the corresponding part of the Soviet draft, Part I. I was simply asking, in regard to the prefatory part of these two documents, whether or not the two co-Chairmen were now going to discuss the matter and prepare one draft. Now, in reply to that, I understood Mr. Dean to say that he would prefer to hear some more views. If that is so, why should we not fix a particular morning, say Monday or Tuesday, by which time any suggestions regarding this part of the draft should be sent in writing to the Secretariat, just as we did for the preamble? Let us say that delegations should put forward suggestions by Tuesday morning, and then the co-Chairmen will have before them not only the results of what we have said here at the meetings but also our thoughts reduced to writing, and they can go ahead and prepare a document. This is what I would suggest. So far as the delegation of India is concerned, we will see whether there is anything further we wish to propose for this Part I, the prefatory stage, of our document. So much for that matter.

Since Mr. Dean did talk about the next stage, may I just say that it seems the Mr. Zorin thought that no further procedural decisions were necessary? It seems that he feels we have started a procedure and it is taking us forward.

(Mr. Lall, India)

Personally, I am willing to wait and see whether that is so. As our Ethiopian colleague said, the United States has produced a draft on prefatory measures, and I am presuming, and I think he is too, that in the next few days we shall be presented with a draft from it on stage I measures, or even measures for stages I, II and III -- certainly another more elaborate paper for the next part of our work. If that does happen, I think when we look at that more elaborate paper -- and we have before us a fairly elaborate draft treaty from the Soviet Union -- it would perhaps be better at that stage, when we are looking at both documents, to see whether any elaboration of procedure is necessary. In other words, if we can congratulate ourselves that we are proceeding fairly satisfactorily, then perhaps we do not have to decide again and again on precisely how we are going to tackle our next stage.

It is a common practice in our Committee to refer to old English proverbs. Well, this is not an old English proverb I am going to refer to, but an old English method of doing things -- that is, "muddling along". If we can congratulate ourselves that we are muddling along fairly effectively, perhaps we can muddle along for a bit, if Mr. Zorin likes this old English method of muddling along. Perhaps he is approaching what we often hear described as "sound Anglo-Saxon principles". In short, I am suggesting that until we have the next papers from the United States, which we are all anticipating, perhaps we need not take any very clear decision about further procedure. Let us go forward. To come back to the prefatory part of our work, let us fix a date by which we should put in our suggestions and let the co-Chairmen work on them and on their own drafts and produce a joint draft, if they can. If they cannot, they will tell us so and we will do something else about it.

Mr. CAVALLETTE (Italy) (translation from French): I really do not think that any of us has the least intention of delaying the work. It is quite clear to me from the statements we have heard these last few days that everyone is really eager to get on and complete it.

However, the questions dealt with in this first article and in the corresponding text of the United States delegation are, as I said a few minutes ago, of absolutely fundamental importance. We are laying the stones on which the structure is to be built, and for my part I think it would be a mistake to try to restrict, reduce or limit discussion on these questions.



(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

Just now I said that unfortunately my delegation had not yet finished studying these texts, especially the United States text which was distributed to us a short time ago. I have the impression that the delegations round this table have not all stated their views. There are some which have not yet expressed their opinions. I see no objection - quite the contrary - to the idea that at some particular stage in the discussion the co-Chairmen, who have done such good work and to whom we owe all our gratitude, should be asked to consider the comments made here and to try to agree on a text which would subsequently be discussed by the Committee.

But I, personally, think it would be much better to allow the Committee a few more meetings to express its views on the two fundamental texts - those of the Soviet Union and the United States. I am sure that if the Committee will give delegations an opportunity of discussing this matter at greater length and in more detail, the two co-Chairmen will be in a much better position to "muddle along", as the distinguished representative of India said, and that they will then really be able to offer us a text that can be easily adopted by this Committee.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): First of all, I wish to thank the representative of Italy for the explanations which he has given in connexion with my question. I am bound to say that these explanations have strengthened the doubts which I expressed when I put this question to him.

As we see from the reply of the representative of Italy, the Italian delegation envisages not one treaty but several treaties. That is what I had suspected, and now it has become more explicit. Moreover, he justifies this by saying that we ourselves have agreed that, in accordance with our procedure of work, we shall draft several such treaties. But this, it seems to me, is obviously a misunderstanding, because paragraph 2 of the Agreed Procedure of Work does not say so. It says something quite different:

"Concurrently with the elaboration of agreement on general and complete disarmament in the plenary committee, and not to the detriment of this elaboration, a committee of the whole will be set up by the plenary Committee for the consideration of various proposals on the

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

implementation of measures aimed at: the lessening of international tension; the consolidation of confidence among States; and facilitating general and complete disarmament". (ENDC/1/Add.1)

Nothing is said to the effect that in this Committee we shall elaborate separate treaties and agreements on separate disarmament measures. No; there is no mention of this. Therefore your interpretation of paragraph 2 does not correspond to its actual content. What we already began to do yesterday in our Committee of the Whole indicates the nature of the work to be done in this Committee. We are examining the question of the cessation of war propaganda. This is a question which will contribute to "the lessening of international tension", "the consolidation of confidence among States" and "facilitating general and complete disarmament"; but it is not at all a disarmament question as such. I think we shall follow this line in the future. In this Committee we shall consider a whole series of questions which will follow the line laid down in the procedure of work which has been approved by us all and which has not given rise to any objections.

What the representative of Italy talked about is quite another matter. It would mean making an attempt to single out individual disarmament measures which are an integral part of a programme of general and complete disarmament and drafting separate treaties for these measures. My interpretation of Mr. Cavalletti's statement is based on the fact that, as he said today, these individual measures would have to be drafted and an appropriate agreement or treaty prepared for them while the treaty was being drafted, if indeed it could be drafted. That is what I heard him say, at least in the Russian interpretation; in other words, doubt was expressed whether it would be possible to draft a treaty on general and complete disarmament. His statement could be taken to mean that, if a treaty could not be drafted, we should change completely and draft individual measures.

But that would not be in accordance with the procedure of work we have approved, because it is stated that even in the Committee of the Whole -

"...concurrently with the elaboration of agreement on general and complete disarmament..., and not to the detriment of this..." (ENDC/1/Add.1).

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

That was not stated at random. It means we have to make efforts to elaborate a treaty on general and complete disarmament. This is our main task. This is reaffirmed in paragraph 1 of the approved procedure of work which states:

"... the Committee should pursue, without delay, its primary objective of reaching agreement on general and complete disarmament." (ibid.)

We have started to carry out this task, but for some reason the Italian delegation has some doubt as to whether it is possible at all to fulfil this task. Why such a doubt has arisen I find absolutely incomprehensible. I will leave it to the Italian delegation itself to examine whether this doubt is well-founded or not. But in any case we should not now shift the centre of gravity of our work to individual disarmament measures, that is to say, measures which form an integral part of a programme of general and complete disarmament and which are to become an integral part of the draft treaty.

Perhaps I have not understood the representative of Italy quite correctly, and if I have not, perhaps he will explain his position. In any case, I think we should act in accordance with the approved procedure. That procedure is perfectly clear. At plenary meetings of the Eighteen-Nation Committee we should carry on the work of elaborating a treaty on general and complete disarmament, and in the Committee of the Whole we should elaborate measures aimed at the lessening of international tension, the consolidation of confidence among States and facilitating general and complete disarmament.

It is this procedure of work that we have been following. And when the representative of India said today, as I understood from the interpretation, that Mr. Zorin might like to "muddle along", he was addressing himself to the wrong quarter. We are not muddling along; we are following a definite course which was approved by us all and which we shall continue to follow. If anyone is muddling along, it is not us. That is the first comment that I wished to make.

As regards the remarks made by the representatives of India and Italy about further work on our basic question and the comments made by the United States' representative, Mr. Dean, I must say that as I see it - and I think this was confirmed by the representative of India - there are no difficulties confronting us at present and there is no need to agree on any new procedures for future work. The representative of Ethiopia, in my opinion, explained this in a way that met with general approval.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

I think it is pointless for us to create difficulties for ourselves in that part of the work in which there are no real difficulties. We have the draft document of the Soviet Union, we have the drafts submitted by the United States as a general programme, as well as individual documents that have now been submitted, and we are proceeding in an entirely normal way in discussing these documents. The only question that has arisen is whether or not we can now finish discussing these documents, in particular, article 1 of the Soviet draft and what was proposed by the United States on 4 April. I suppose that if there is a desire to express further views regarding these documents, there are no grounds for impeding this.

I think that perhaps we shall also devote the next meeting to hearing the comments of all the delegates, so that we can take into consideration the opinions of all the members of the Committee or at least of those who consider it necessary to say something on this question.

In regard to subsequent work, I think that the proposal put forward by the representative of India deserves our attention. If any of the members of the Committee consider it necessary, besides oral statements, to make any written proposals, we cannot object to that either. Then it will obviously be necessary to fix a time-limit for submitting these comments in writing so that the co-Chairman could meet and discuss in a business-like manner the Soviet Union's proposal, the United States' proposal and any other proposals and comments which have been made by delegations and which may be submitted in writing. And then we shall try to harmonize our positions and produce a joint draft of part I, the introductory or first part of a treaty and move on to the subsequent parts.

I think this is a normal procedure and, as I gathered, the United States representative appears to have spoken in the same sense. He said that we should base all our work on the documents which have been submitted. We are in fact basing this work on the documents submitted. In my opinion, there is at present no question of any change in our procedure of work. As regards the future discussion of questions related to the stages of disarmament, I understood the United States representative to say that he thought there should be a full general debate on questions of substance. I do not quite understand what he meant, but I think we are all now having a debate on questions of substance, both on the substance of the aims and purposes and on the substance of the concrete drafts which are proposed and of the obligations put forward as a basis for a treaty.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

It is true that Mr. Godber also spoke about a general, exhaustive debate. I do not quite understand what he meant. When we come to the stages of disarmament, how can we have a general debate then? There will be a discussion as to which measures should be included in the first stage - why precisely these and not others - what means of control could be implemented in this regard and, perhaps, what further measures are necessary in respect of this first stage. I can understand that. But it will be a concrete discussion regarding documents which have already been submitted or which will be submitted. Therefore, I do not quite understand what is the point of having some sort of general debate. Perhaps the State Department statement of 3 April has some bearing on this. I have read it carefully. It states:

"...what is needed soon is an exploration of essential substantial problems requiring agreement before the precise language of a comprehensive programme on general and complete disarmament can be developed".

I have carefully reflected upon these words. I think that they have a definite meaning. The United States State Department obviously pondered on this wording. Judging from this State Department statement, for some reason or other, we shall soon need to explore essential substantial problems. Naturally, the question arises as to which problems are to be considered "essential". This means that we shall argue about which is essential and which is not; and why should this be necessary? Are we not already discussing essential problems now? I think we are. In the very first section both we and the United States have set forth the main problems which need to be solved in general and complete disarmament.

So I do not quite understand what is envisaged. If it is supposed that when we come to the first stage of disarmament we should single out certain problems from the whole system of these stages, I can say in advance that this procedure would disrupt the normal course of our work and it would not help matters, because we are not prepared to consider individual problems in isolation. We are prepared to consider these problems in connection with a concrete programme of disarmament stages, because the basic questions of what must be done in implementing general and complete disarmament have already been agreed upon. The task before us now is to set this down in section I and then go on to decide which of these measures will be considered and incorporated in the draft agreement for stage I, for stage II and for stage III.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

I think that it is perfectly normal to discuss what will be included in stage I, in stage II and in stage III. But if there is to be an attempt to select certain problems from all three stages and to discuss them separately, I can say beforehand that we shall not agree to this. It would disrupt the procedure which has already been established and accepted by everyone as the normal one.

I am making these remarks in a preliminary way, because I do not quite understand the full meaning of the State Department statement and of certain remarks that were dropped today by the United Kingdom representative and subsequently by the United States representative. But I think that we ought not to waste our time now in discussing these questions, especially as they are premature. Let us continue and conclude our work on part 1 of the draft treaty. As we have already called a meeting of the Committee of the Whole for Monday, it is proposed that the Conference meet next on Tuesday 10 April, when perhaps the Co-Chairmen will report on the results of the efforts to agree on the preamble. There will probably be an exchange of views and then we can pass on to consideration of part 1 and the proposals made by the United States. After discussion of these questions we shall decide what time-limit to fix for the submission of written comments that may be made by delegates. When we have finished this work and discussed subsequent documents, we shall pass on to the consideration of the first stage of disarmament. This seems to me to be a perfectly natural procedure.

With regard to the last comment of the United States representative that he is ready to meet me to discuss questions, I, too, am ready to meet him. At the present juncture we have been meeting and shall probably meet again to discuss the preamble. With respect to the subsequent parts of the document, we shall, of course, meet after the general exchange of views on this part of the document has been concluded. That, it seems to me, is how our work should be organized

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): I apologise for speaking again. I shall be very brief.

I thank Mr. Zorin for giving special attention to the statement I made this morning. I note, however, that our old friendship does not prevent him from

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

insinuating that the Italian delegation is opposed to a treaty on general and complete disarmament and considers it impossible. I do not know how my words were interpreted into Russian, but the notes I have before me, and from which I read just now, contain the following words:

"... without prejudice, of course" - I was referring to special treaties - "to the treaty on general and complete disarmament which we must sign" -- I stress the word "must". I really think that in this respect there can be no doubt about the thought and the attitude of the Italian delegation.

As to paragraph 2 of our procedure, (ENDC/1/Add.1), I fear that there is in fact a difference of interpretation. The representative of the Soviet Union thinks that paragraph can be applied only to special measures proposed by the Soviet delegation. We think, on the contrary, that point 2 can also be applied to the measures which Mr. Segni, our Minister for Foreign Affairs, proposed to the Conference concerning the use of outer space, cut-offs, and the prevention of surprise attacks.

Since the question is not on the agenda for the present meeting, I shall not detain the Committee any longer. I think there is a difference of interpretation, but I am sure that with good-will on both sides it will be possible to reach agreement.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I would like to assure Mr. Zorin, as the representative of Italy has just done, that we do not have the slightest doubt about the complete feasibility of working out an agreement at this Conference on general and complete disarmament. We shall continue to devote ourselves to that task. I do not think there is any real difference of opinion between us on the fact that we must address ourselves to the concrete and specific problems of the various texts before us.

We agree with Mr. Zorin's suggestion that we should have one further meeting at which members could express their views on these problems and that we should then turn to the examination of part I of these specific texts.

I believe that the representative of Italy was saying -- and I am open to correction if I am wrong -- that while we address ourselves primarily to the question of general complete disarmament, and without being diverted from that subject, we could discuss, in accordance with our agreed procedure of work, the implementation of measures separately. We believe that these are the

(Mr. Dean, United States)

measures which the representative of Italy referred to; they are the measures which, it seems to me, are envisaged in paragraph 2 of the agreed procedure of work.

However, let me assure the representative of the Soviet Union that I do not think there is any basic difference between us on the need to address ourselves to these specific texts and problems. We must get on with the work of general and complete disarmament. As far as we are concerned, we are quite sure that it is completely feasible.

The CHAIRMAN (Brazil) (translation from French): I note that certain very important comments have been made during the present meeting, on the procedure and method of work to be followed in drafting the preamble and in preparing the subsequent articles and the general principles of general and complete disarmament. The representatives of Czechoslovakia, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, the United States, Italy, Ethiopia and India have given us their views on this subject.

In addition, proposals have been put forward by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Ethiopia and India.

I think the Conference can feel sure that the record of the meeting will be carefully studied by the co-Chairmen and their respective delegations, and that at our next meeting, which will be held on Tuesday, 10 April, it will be possible to have a precise idea of the dates in question here. That is to say, on 10 April we shall be able to conclude the discussion, and the presentation of ideas, opinions and suggestions, and fix a time-limit for the submission of written proposals relating to the first part of the treaty. This will be a difficult task over and above the very heavy tasks already allotted to our two co-Chairmen.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its sixteenth meeting at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of Mr. de Mello-Franco, the representative of Brazil.

"Statements were made by the representatives of Czechoslovakia, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, Italy, Ethiopia, India and the United States.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 10 April, 1962, at 10 a.m."

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.